

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT SEATTLE

RICCARDO GREEN,

Plaintiff(s),

v.

SEATTLE ART MUSEUM,

Defendant(s).

NO. C07-58MJP

ORDER ON MOTION FOR  
RECONSIDERATION

The above-entitled Court, having received and reviewed:

1. Plaintiff's Motion for Reconsideration Local Rule 7(h) (Dkt. No. 52)
2. Plaintiff's Surreply to Defendant's Opposition to Plaintiff's Motion for Leave to Serve Additional Interrogatories (Dkt. No. 51)

and all exhibits and declarations attached thereto, makes the following ruling:

IT IS ORDERED that the motion for reconsideration is DENIED.

Plaintiff alleges error in the Court's failure to consider his "Surreply to Defendant's Opposition to Plaintiff's Motion for Leave to Serve Additional Interrogatories," a document which was filed on October 10, 2007, five days after the noting date for Plaintiff's motion, and not received by the Court until after the order denying Plaintiff's motion had been filed.

Local Rule 7(h) delineates very specifically the issues which may be addressed in a motion to reconsider: "'matters which the movant believes were overlooked or misapprehended by the court, [and] any new matters being brought to the court's attention for the first time.'" Since Plaintiff's original motion (the only document filed prior to the noting date) contained neither the nature of the additional interrogatories nor the grounds for requesting them, there was nothing which could be overlooked or misapprehended.

1 Nor does the motion contain “any new matters being brought to the court’s attention for the  
2 first time;” in other words, matters which could not have been raised in the original motion because  
3 they had only been discovered since the motion was filed. Plaintiff’s motion for reconsideration merely  
4 introduces evidence and arguments that Plaintiff failed to bring in his original motion, evidence which  
5 he could have introduced but did not. As has been pointed out in earlier orders, Plaintiff has litigated a  
6 multitude of cases in this district and will be expected to adhere to the levels of knowledge,  
7 competence and professionalism that would be required of any other practitioner.

8 Plaintiff’s motion for reconsideration is denied, and he will not be permitted to file any  
9 interrogatories above and beyond that permitted by the rules of discovery.

10  
11 The clerk is directed to provide copies of this order to all counsel of record.

12 Dated: October \_\_23\_\_, 2007

13  
14 

15 Marsha J. Pechman  
16 U.S. District Judge  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25